

Wickremasinghe, M. de Z. (1900) *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum* (British Museum, London)
 Winternitz, M. (1933) *History of Indian Literature*, vol. II (Calcutta)

KHANDHAKAVATTA

Loss of text in the Pāli Vinayapiṭaka?

In a recent issue of this journal (*JPTS* XIII, 1989, pp. 83–100) G. Schopen has drawn attention again to the fact that no rules are prescribed in the Khandhaka of the Theravāda Vinaya regulating the veneration of *stūpas*. This has been pointed out earlier, as Schopen recalls, by A. Bareau in 1960 and again by G. Roth in 1980. The explanation given by both these scholars is that the Theravāda Vinaya reflects a very early stage of the development of Buddhist ecclesiastical law, when there was no need felt for the respective regulations, or, alternatively, that it had been the concern of laymen rather than monks to care for *stūpas*. In the end both interpretations may complement each other: for during the early times of Buddhism monks may have left matters of worship to laymen.

Now Schopen has traced two passages, one from the Visuddhimagga, the other from the Mahā-Parākramabāhu-Katikāvata formulated during the 12th century, where rules for the conduct towards *stūpas* are, in fact, mentioned. The word used for “conduct” here is *vatta* < Skt *vrutta* or < Skt *vrata* “duty”, as both words, which are semantically near to each other may have been confused in Pāli perhaps, also possibly due to the likely orthographic reform introducing double consonants.¹ At the same time the word *khandhakavatta* occurs in these very rules, which, consequently, seem to have been based on the Vattakkhandhaka, the eighth chapter of the Cullavagga, Vin II 207–235. This has been assumed universally by modern Pāli scholars, as Schopen correctly states.

¹ O.v. Hinüber: *Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1989, Nr. 11. Stuttgart 1989: chapter XIII. Die Orthographie der ersten Aufzeichnung des Theravāda-Kanons, pp. 63–66.

However, Schopen seems to be the first who has cared to compare the relevant text of the Visuddhimagga:

avasesāni pi cetiyaṅganavatta-bodhiyaṅganavatta-uposathāgāra-vatta-bhojana-sālā-jantāghara-ācariya-upajjhāya-āgantuka-gamikavattād-īni sabbāni khandhakavattāni pūretabbān' eva, Vism HOS VI § 60 = 153,27-31 = PTS 188,5-9.

to the corresponding Vinaya passage, where nothing is said about a *cetiyaṅganavatta*, on which Schopen concentrates, nor about a *bodhiyaṅganavatta*, as mentioned in passing by Schopen (JPTS XIII, 1989, p. 88 note 15), nor about *uposathāgāra* and *bhojanasālāvatta*, which are not discussed at all. This result makes Schopen argue with all necessary and very much commendable caution that there might be a gap in the Theravāda Vinaya as we read it today, because the rules concerning *stūpas*, etc., (pp. 94, 98) still known in 12th century Ceylon, could have dropped out in the course of the text tradition as did, of course, if this assumption is correct, those concerning the *bodhi* tree, the *uposatha* house, and the refectory (*bhojanasālā*), if one does not prefer to consider the latter word as simply replacing canonical *bhattachāra*(*vatta*), cf. Vin II 212,36–215,4.

If all this is correct, we have to reckon with a considerable loss of text at an early date, perhaps even before the composition of the Samantapāsādikā, where no such rules about *stūpas* are commented on in the Vattakkhandhaka (Sp 1280,35–1286,27), and not, as Schopen seems to be inclined to believe, although with reservations (p. 93), only after the 12th century. The far reaching consequences for the evaluation of the whole Theravāda tradition are so very obvious that a second look at the relevant Vinaya texts does not seem to be totally out of place. For, as far as my knowledge goes, the only gap traced so far in a text of the Theravāda tradition was observed long ago by H. Oldenberg in the

Aggaññasutta of the Dīghanikāya, where a few lines are missing.² This, however, is only of minor importance compared to the loss of a complete set of Vinaya rules.

The first crucial point duly discussed by Schopen is whether or not the *khandhakavatta* mentioned in the Visuddhimagga and in the Katikāvata really refer to the corresponding chapter in the Cullavagga. As Schopen emphasises, not only modern European scholars were of the opinion, but also the Sinhala Vinaya expert Sāriputta, author of the Sāratthadīpanī (Sp-ṭ), a 12th century subcommentary on the Samantapāsādikā, and contemporary with the Katikāvata referred to, “specifically identified” (p. 85) the *khandhakavatta* with those rules given in the Vinayapitaka. Although this is no doubt correct, it seems to be worth while having a look at what Sāriputta really has to say. As the respective text may not be easily available everywhere, the passage is quoted here in full and accompanied by a translation:

cuddasa khandhakavattāni nāma vattakkhandhake vuttāni āgantuka-vattam āvāsika-gamika-anumodana-bhattachāra-piṇḍacārika-āraññika-senāsana-jantāghara-vaccakūṭi-upajjhāya-saddhivihārika-ācariya-antevāsika-vattan ti imāni cuddasa vuttāni. tato aññāni pana kadāci tajjanīyakammakatādikāle yeva caritabbāni dve-asiti mahāvattāni. na sabbāsu avatthāsu caritabbāni. tasmā cuddassa khandhakavattesu aganitāni. tāni pana “pāriyāsikānam bhikkhūnam vattam paññāpessāmī” ti ārabhitvā “na upasampādetabbāñ. pa. na chamāyāñ cañkamante cañkame cañkamitabban” ti vuttāvasānāni chasatthi. tato pana “na bhikkhave pāriyāsikena bhikkhunā pāriyāsikavuḍḍhatarena bhikkhunā saddhim, mūlāyapaṭikassanārahena, mānattārahena, mānattacārikena, abbhānārahena bhikkhunā saddhim ekacchanne āvāse vatthabban” ti-

² H. Oldenberg: *Studien zum Mahāvastu*, 1912 = *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1967, II 1037–68, p. 1045 (131) note 1. The gap traced by Oldenberg in Ee and Se is confirmed today also by Ce (1929) and Be (1956). As the text lost is not commented on (Sv 868,33–869,1), the gap may be older than the final redaction of the Sumaṅgalavilāsini.

ādinā vuttavattāni pakatattacaritabbehi anaññattā visum aganetvā pārivāsikavuddhatarādīsu puggalantaresu caritabbattā tesam vasena sampin̄detvā ekekam̄ katvā gañitāni pañcāhi ekasattati vattāni, ukkhepanīyakam makatavattesu vuttam “na pakatattassa bhikkhuno abhivādanam paccuññānam. pa. nahāne piññiparikammam sāditabban” ti idam abhivādanādīnam asādiyanam ekam, “na pakatatto bhikkhu silavipattiyā anuddhamsetabbo” ti-ādīni ca dasāhi evam etāni dvāsīti vattāni. etesv eva pana kadāci tajjaniyakammādivattāni, kadāci pārivāsikādivattāni aggahitaggahanena dvāsīti eva. aññattha pana atthakathāpadese appakam̄ ūnam adhikam̄ vā gananūpagam na hoti ti “asīti khandhakavattāni” ti vuttam, Sp-ṭ Be II 35,11–36,2 (on Sp 225,27) = Sp-ṭ Be II 198,22–199,13 (on Sp 415,27) ≠ Ps Be III 16,9–29 (on Ps III 30,12).³

“Fourteen *khandhakavatta* (Sp 225,27)”: Duties prescribed in the Vattakkhandhaka that is the duties concerning incoming monks, resident monks, leaving monks, thanks giving, the refectory, walking for alms food, living in the forest, lodgings, baths, privy, preceptors, companions, teachers, pupils. These are fourteen duties. In addition there are other “82 great duties” (Sp 225,28), which have to be observed occasionally, namely at the time, when a *tajjaniyakamma*, etc., has been committed. They must not be observed at all stages (of monkhood). Therefore they are not counted among the 14 *khandhaka*-duties. These, beginning with “I shall prescribe the duties for monks under probation” (Vin II 31,26), and ending with “He should not ordain (Vin II 32,2), etc., he should not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down if he is pacing up and down on the ground” (Vin II 33,22), are 66; furthermore, “Monks, a monk under probation should not stay in residence under a common roof with a senior monk under probation, deserving to be sent

³ Older editions of Sp-ṭ are listed in: H. Smith: Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Volume I, Copenhagen 1948, 1.2,12. An edition in Siamese characters was printed in Bangkok 1931/32.

back to the beginning, deserving *mānatta*, undergoing *mānatta*, deserving rehabilitation” (Vin II 33,22–27), etc. (These) duties prescribed (in the Vinaya) are not counted individually, because they are not different from those to be kept in respect to regular monks, (and) they have been combined and abbreviated in respect to different individuals, namely senior monks under probation etc. with whom they must be kept. If each is counted as one, they are five, (and altogether then) 71 (that is: 66 + 5) duties. Among the duties for those, who have committed an offence leading to suspension it is said: “He should not consent to a regular monk’s greeting him, standing up before him, etc., treating his back by massage in a bath” (Vin II 22,20–23). This not consenting to greeting, etc., (is counted as) one. And: “He should not defame a regular monk with falling away from moral habit” (Vin II 20,23 foll.), etc., (are) 10. Thus there are 82 duties. Among these (82) sometimes the duties concerning *tajjaniyakamma*, etc., sometimes the duties concerning probationers, etc., (are to be followed). By apprehension of what is (implicitly) included there are exactly 82. Elsewhere in the Atthakathā it is said: “80 *khandhaka*-duties”⁴ with the intention that not even a little less or too much should be counted.”

In spite of the long enumeration and thorough discussion of the *khandhakavatta* and their relation to the Vinayapiñṭaka, *cetiyāñgañavatta*, etc., are not referred to, and no room seems to be left to include them here in Sāriputta’s reasoning by any means of interpretation.

This negative evidence is fully confirmed by passages from the Atthakathā:

ekacco hi vattasampanno hoti: tassa dve-asīti khuddaka(= Ne)vattāni; cuddasa mahāvattāni; cetiyāñgana-bodhiyāñgana-

⁴ This may refer to: *aggahitaggahanena ganiyamānāni asīti khandhakavattāni nāma honti*, Vjb Be 1956, 535,18 on the Vattakkhandhaka. Here, too, the 14 *khandhakavattas* are enumerated as in Sp-ṭ.

bodhiyaṅgaṇa-pāṇīyamāla-uposathāgāra-āgantuka-gamika-vattāni ca karontassa ..., Mp I 30,11–14 = Vibh-a 297,4–7.

Here, *cetiyaṅgaṇavatta*, etc., are clearly distinguished as a class of their own with no immediate connection to the Vinayapiṭaka. In contrast to Sāriputta's reckoning quoted above, the 14 duties of the Vattakkhandhaka are called "great duties" here and at Sp 415,28, while elsewhere as at Sp 225,27 there are 84 *mahāvatta* in accordance with Sāriputta's opinion. If the duties prescribed in the Vinayapiṭaka are the *mahāvatta*, then it makes good sense to change *khandhaka* into *khuddaka* as in Vibh-a and in part of the Mp-tradition.⁵

Further the Vinaya handbooks such as Vin-vn, verses 2914 foll., count 14 *khandhakavatta* in accordance with the Vinayapiṭaka, which again shows that this is a well defined set of rules. In the Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgaha (Pālim Be 1956, 233,2–4) only 11 rules are enumerated, and *anumodana*, *saddhivihārika*, and *antevāsika* are left out. They are, however, duly supplied in the commentary (Pālim-ṭ Be 1977, II 1,11). All these texts do not mention any duties concerning *cetiyas*, *bodhi* tree, etc.

On the other hand the *cetiyaṅgaṇavatta*, etc., are clearly distinguished from those mentioned in the Vinayapiṭaka. For, when commenting on:

cetiyaṅgaṇavattādiasitīmāhāvattapatiṭipūraṇam, Ps III 30,12,

⁵ The variant *khuddaka* is also found in two old Pāli manuscripts from North Thailand kept in the library of the Siam Society, Bangkok (cf. O. von Hinüber, *Journal of the Siam Society*, 75, 1987, pp. 9–74): No. 55 *Manorathapūraṇī* (copied AD 1531/1532) fasc. (phūk) 2, folio *gu a 5*: *dve-asiti khuddakavattāni cuddasa vattāni* (sic !): here °*bodhiyaṅgaṇa*° is omitted as well; No. 59 *Sammohavinodāni* (undated, 16th century) fasc. (phūk) 14, folio *lam a 3*: *dve-asiti khuddakavattāni cetiy°*, where *cuddasa mahāvattāni* is omitted.

it is said:

cetiyaṅgaṇavattādī ti ādisaddena bodhiyaṅgaṇavattādīni saṅgaṇhāti. asitīmāhāvattapatiṭipūraṇam ti ... tattha māhāvattāni nāma vattakkhandhake vuttāni āgantukavattam, Ps-ṭ Be III 16,8–9,

which again shows that the canonical and the non-canonical sets of duties are kept well apart. Thus there can be hardly any doubt that from the time of Buddhaghosa and his Visuddhimagga, at the latest, onwards, the Theravāda tradition did not know of a canonical Vinaya text containing duties concerning *cetiyas* or *bodhi* trees, nor are there any traces of an opinion held by legal experts ascribing those rules to the Vinayapiṭaka. For the 14 *khandhakavatta* enumerated and defined in the commentaries always fully agree with the extant Vinayapiṭaka.

Still the fact remains that a set of duties going beyond the Vinayapiṭaka is found at the commentarial level. The list found in the Visuddhimagga and quoted by Schopen comprises the following 9 items: 1. *cetiyaṅgaṇa*, 2. *bodhiyaṅgaṇa*, 3. *uposathāgāra*, 4. *bhojanasālā*, 5. *jantāghara*, 6. *ācariya*, 7. *upajjhāya*, 8. *āgantuka*, 9. *gamika*. Thus this is the most comprehensive list of these *vattas* met with so far in the commentaries. Elsewhere similar lists occur without any fixed order or number of duties such as the one quoted above from the *Manorathapūraṇī* and the *Sammohavinodāni* (Vibh-a) with 6 items, a further list in Dhp-a I 379,15–18, where *bodhiyaṅgaṇa* is missing, or:

tassa hi cetiyaṅgaṇabodhiyaṅgaṇavattam katam eva hoti, upajjhāyavatta-ācariyavattādīni sabbavattāni pūreti, Sv 529,31–33.

These four duties arranged in the same order and followed by *jantāghara* and *uposathāgāra* are named in Sp 415,25–27.

As the duties concerning *cetiya* and *bodhi* tree, which usually stand side by side, are not defined in the Vinayapiṭaka, it is necessary to search in the commentaries to find out what they actually are. This is

stated *ex negativo* in a passage dealing with those who do not pay respect to a Buddha:

yo buddhe dharamāne upatīthānam na gacchati, parinibbute cetiyatīthānam bodhiatīthānam na gacchati, cetiyam vā bodhim vā na vandati cetiyaṅgane sacchatto sa-upāhano carati, Sp 1315,8–11.

“Who does not, while a Buddha is living, attend to him, and, when he has entered Nirvāna, does not visit a place where there is a *cetiya* or a *bodhi* tree (cf. DN II 140,17–30 = AN II 120,24–34), does not venerate a *cetiya* or a *bodhi* tree, walks in the courtyard of a *cetiya* holding an umbrella and wearing shoes.” Further details are found in the commentary on the passage from the Mahāparinibbānasutta (DN II 141,9) just mentioned:

cetiyacārikam āhīḍantā ti tattha tattha cetiyaṅganam sammajjantā āsanāni dhovantā bodhimhi udakam āsiñcantā āhīḍanti, tesu vattabbam eva n' atthi. asukavihāre cetiyam vandissāmā ti ... , Sv 582,20–23.

“Wandering about to visit *cetiyas* means: they walk around everywhere sweeping the courtyard of a *cetiya*, washing the seats and watering a *bodhi* tree; with them there is no fault. Thinking: ‘In that monastery we shall venerate a *cetiya*’”

Sweeping is indeed the usual duty referred to:

kāyena karaṇakammam paññāyati cetiyaṅganasammajjana-bodhiyaṅgā-sammajjana-abhikkamana-paṭikkamana-vattānuvatta-karan ti, Mp III 146,18–20.

“He knows the deed to be done by the body: all sorts of duties such as sweeping the courtyard of a *cetiya*, sweeping the courtyard of a

bodhi tree, or concerning the arrival and departure (from a monastery).” Again sweeping is mentioned at Ps I 259,9 = Pj II 57,16 or:

yassa pāto vuṭṭhāya cetiyaṅganavattādīni sabbavattāni katān' eva, Mp-ṭ Be II 325,3.

“By whom all duties such as the duty concerning the courtyard are done, after he has got up in the morning”, cf. also Ja I 449,21–25, where a more popular view on these duties is expressed. The duty to sweep a courtyard is also required as one of the four duties in respect to an *uposathāgāra*: *sammajjituṁ*, Vin I 118,5 “to sweep”, *āsanam paññāpetuṁ*, Vin I 118,16 “to prepare a seat”, *padipam kātum*, Vin I 118,26 “to provide a lamp”, *pāniyam paribhojaniyam upatīthāpetuṁ*, Vin I 119,1 “to supply drinking water”. These, however, are not included in any passage of the Vattakkhandhaka.

Although *bhojanasālāvatta* at a first glance may simply continue and replace the older technical term *bhāttaggavatta* — *bhojanasālā* does not seem to occur in canonical Pāli as far as the lexicographical aids available can be trusted — a passage in the Samantapāsādikā shows that this is not necessarily so:

cetiyaṅgane sammajjaniṁ gahetvā bhojanasālaṅganam vā uposathāgāraṅganam vā parivenadivāṭhāna-aggisālādisu vā aññatarām sammajjītvā dhovitvā puna sammajjānīmālakē ṭhāpetabbā, Sp 773,14–17.

“Having taken up a broom in the courtyard of a *cetiya*, having swept and scrubbed the courtyard of a *bhojanasālā*, an *uposathāgāra*, or a cell, a day-room or a fire-room, etc., respectively, it must be put back into the broom-cupboard.”⁶ In the Vinayapiṭaka itself, sweeping is not

⁶ This passage adds a further *vatta*: *āsanasālam sammajjantena vattam jānitabbam. tatiḍam vattam: majhato pāṭīṭhāya pāṭīṭhānābhīmukhā vālikā haritabbā, kacavaram hatthehi gahetvā bahi chaddetabbam*, Sp 773,28–31 “if he sweeps the sitting room, he must know the procedure. This is the procedure

included in the *bhattachavatta*, which only regulates the correct behaviour when participating in a meal, and it may have found its place within the duties in the *bhajanasañlā* by expansion of those required in the *uposathāgāra*.

All this, the enlargement and the transformation of the list of *vattas*, comprising some of those also included in the Vattakkhandhaka and at the same time excluding others, clearly shows that the differences between what is said in the Vinayapiṭaka and in the commentaries are not due to a loss of text from the Theravāda Vinaya tradition, but to the development of ecclesiastical law during a period of certainly more than half a millennium. This may be observed very well when comparing the canonical and the post-canonical passages e.g. on *gamikānam bhikkhūnam vattam*:

Vin II 211,21–31:

*dārubhañḍam mattikābhañḍam
paṭisāmetvā dvāravātāpānam
thaketvā senāsanam āpuccchā
pakkamitabbam ...
sace vihāro ovassati sace ussahati
chādetabbo ussukam vā
kātabbam kin ti nu kho vihāro
chādiyethā ti.*

Sp 777,21–25:

*dārubhañḍam mattikābhañḍam
paṭisāmetvā dvāravātāpānāni
pidahitvā gamiyavattam pūretvā
gantabbam.
sace pana senāsanam ovassati
chādanatthañ ca tiñam vā iṭṭhakā
vā ānītā honti sace ussahati
chādetabbam, etc.*

Here again words are changed such as *pidahitvā* in the commentary against *thaketvā* in the Vinayapiṭaka in the same way as *bhajanasañlā* replaces *bhattachava*, or *abhikkamana*: *paṭikamana* stands for canonical *āgantuka*: *gamika* in Mp II 146 quoted above. Further the very basic rules

here: beginning in the middle he should collect the dust towards the skirting board and throw the rubbish out with his hands." This, at the same time, shows that it is not always easy to distinguish between *vatta* "duty" and "conduct, procedure".

for protecting furniture of a monastery given in the Vinayapiṭaka are expanded and explained in much greater detail meeting the needs of a more developed life style of Buddhist monks. Another example for the development of Vinaya rules are the very detailed *āgantuka*- and *āvāsikavattus* relating to dwelling places during the rainy season found only in Sp 1226,1–1235,23, and thus expanding the Vassupāniyakkhandhaka, Vin I 137–156. In spite of this there is again no need at all to postulate any loss of text. For the ecclesiastical law continued to develop until present times, the Vinayapiṭaka being used only as a point of reference also for modern books such as Vajirañāṇavarorasa's "Entrance to the Vinaya (Vinayamukha)", which originally appeared between 1916 and 1921 in Bangkok, to name only one example.

Already at the time when the Samantapāsādikā was composed, there was, and most probably had been for centuries, a lively discussion on Vinaya rules within the Theravāda tradition with different views being accepted or rejected, e.g.:

Andhakaṭṭhakathāyam pana ... bhāsitam tam dubbhāsitam, Sp 697,17–19,

or:

Andhakaṭṭhakathāyam pana ... ti vuttam. tam n' eva aṭṭhakathāyam na pāliyā vuttam, tasmā na gahetabbam, Sp 1069,19–22.

Going even beyond the Vinayapiṭaka was not altogether unacceptable as the principle of *pālimuttaka-vinicchaya*, Sp VIII 1591a, 17 foll., shows.

Therefore there is no reason to doubt the completeness of the text as read in the Theravāda Vinaya, if slightly different opinions or even modified, if not entirely new, rules not traceable in any canonical text surface only in the commentaries. These are problems concerning exclusively the vast and largely unexplored field of the development of

Buddhist law, and not the text tradition. Consequently the astonishing fact pointed out again by Schopen remains that not much is found in the Theravāda Vinaya about duties in respect of *cetiyas*, in complete contradistinction to the Vinayas of other schools. Whatever the ultimate explanation of this evidence may be, there is certainly no loss of text involved, and the doubts and reservations expressed by Schopen himself against his own views, proffered only tentatively, prove to be fully justified.

Freiburg

O. v. Hinüber

A NOTE ON AMBAPĀLĪ'S WIT

The *Therigāthā* contains a justly famous poem attributed to Ambapālī, verses 252–70. The former courtesan describes the wrack of her beauty in old age; each of the nineteen verses in turn describes the decay of a physical feature, moving down from the hair of her head in the first verse to her feet in the eighteenth.

The last verse (270) reads:

*ediso ahu ayam samussayo jajjaro bahudukhānam ālayo
so 'palepapatito jarāgharo saccavādivacanam anāññathā.*

It seems to have escaped the attention of commentators and translators that this contains an excellent pun. Her body, which used to have all the beauties described at the beginning of each of the previous verses, is now compared in its entirety to a house in ruinous condition, “with its plaster fallen off”, as Norman translates. He discusses the phrase and cites the commentary in his note on the verse.¹ There is some doubt about the text of the commentary itself, but it is clear both that the commentary saw two ways of construing the phrase and that it took the metaphor of plaster as referring to *abhisamkhāra*, which I understand to mean the store of good *kamma*: the commentator is saying that Ambapālī’s luck has run out. I may have misunderstood *abhisamkhāra*; but certainly the commentator has not seen the pun I am about to point out, and that is probably because he did not understand the *p/v* alternation. Norman in his note refers to that alternation and sees that *apalepa* is a phonetic variant for *avalepa*, but draws no conclusion from that fact.

Monier-Williams’ *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* gives for *avalepa* a meaning “pride, haughtiness” — such as a woman might have in her beauty. So *apalepa-patito* means “pride-fallen”. The primary meaning, I suggest, is that her beauty has fallen from its proud condition, but the

¹ K.R. Norman, *Elders' Verses II*, London 1971, p. 119.